

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.82468 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-296 Year-2024 Thana- DINARA District- Rohtas

Prashant Kumar Singh @ Pintu singh @ Pinnu singh Son of Late Sri Niwas Singh
Resident of Village- Jamrodh, P.S.- Dinara, District- Rohtas Petitioner/s
Versus

The State of Bihar Opposite Party/s

Appearance :
For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Manoj Kumar Singh, Adv.
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Md. Fahimuddin, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV ROY
ORAL ORDER

3 13-02-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned counsel representing the informant and the State.

2. The petitioner is in custody in connection with Dinara P.S. Case No. 296 of 2024 for the offence punishable under sections 127(1), 109, 3(5) and 115(2) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita and section 27 of the Arms Act lodged on 03.07.2024 by the informant, Saurabh Kumar Singh.

3. As per the prosecution story, the informant alleged that on minor issue of dumping of soil, the petitioner started assaulting his son. The locals pacified the matter and his son returned but on the same day, both this petitioner and one Mangaru Sah entered his house and once again, the assault took place.

4. Later they escaped. On 03.07.2024, the informant was taking meal when Mangaru Sah instigated the petitioner who opened fire which resulted into injury to his friend. As the other family members came, they also suffered injuries. This led to the FIR and the injured were taken to the Hospital.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that though the main role has been attributed to this petitioner, only one of the injuries has been found to be grievous in nature and there is a land



dispute between the parties.

6. The informant is represented through the learned counsel and according to him, a bare perusal of the FIR would show that it was the petitioner herein who resorted to indiscriminate firing causing injuries to the family members of the informant. Merely because only of the injuries have been found to be grievous, that does not exonerate the petitioner of the indiscriminate firing.

7. Having gone through the facts of the case as also the submissions of the parties, the petitioner being the person who resorted to indiscriminate firing as alleged in the FIR, in that background, this Court is not inclined to extend relief to the petitioner.

8. Accordingly, the prayer of the petitioner for bail stands rejected.

9. The learned Trial Court is requested to expedite the trial in view of the fact that the bail application of the petition stands rejected.

(Rajiv Roy, J)

perwez

U		T	
---	--	---	--

